

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 915

FI 012 690

AUTHOR Krahne, Karl J.
TITLE Incorporating Communicative Instruction Into Academic Preparation ESL Curricula.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the TESOL Annual Summer Meeting (3rd, New York, NY, July 24-26, 1981).
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Awareness; *Curriculum Design; *English (Second Language); Higher Education; Individualized Education Programs; Language Acquisition; Language Skills; Language Styles; Language Usage; Literacy; Program Content; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

A curriculum rationale and model which meet the constraints of what is known of communicatively-based language teaching/learning are presented. The curricula prepares non-English speaking students for higher educational experiences in the U.S. Current program rationales, communicative and interactive teaching, and issues in curriculum design are reviewed. The curriculum model presented takes into account language acquisition and the relationship between language and its function in communication. The curriculum includes: (1) different instructional techniques for different levels of linguistic and communicative development; (2) deliberate depersonalization of language behavior through increasingly culture-specific or abstract stimuli and information which require the learners to develop increasingly objective rather than subjective points of view; and (3) increased use of individualized learning activities as the general aspects of the language have developed and individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs have become more apparent. (JK)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED210915

Karl J. Krahnke
 Institute for Intercultural
 Learning
 13016 Greenwood Avenue North
 Seattle, Washington 98133

INCORPORATING COMMUNICATIVE INSTRUCTION INTO ACADEMIC PREPARATION ESL CURRICULA

This paper is written from the point of view of a curriculum planner. Curriculum planning seems to be an underdeveloped effort in the overall enterprise of language teaching. We tend to have collections of classes, textbooks, and "methods", but rarely do we talk much about overall, planned curricula. This shortcoming, especially from the point of view of communicative teaching methodologies, has been pointed out effectively by Candlin in his preface to Oller's book on pragmatic language testing:

It is, in retrospect, with remarkable speed that the main principles and assumptions have become accepted of what can be called the teaching and learning of language as communication. Acceptance, of course, does not imply practical implementation . . . Courses are being designed, and textbooks written, with a communicative goal, even if, as experiments, they are necessarily partial in the selection of principles they choose to emphasize.

. . . Discussion of a communicative approach has been very largely concentrated on syllabus specification and, to a lesser extent, on the design of exercise types, rather than on any coherent and consistent view of what we can call the communicative curriculum. Rather than examine the necessary interdependence of the traditional curriculum components: purposes, methods, and evaluations, from the standpoint of a communicative view of language and language learning, we have been happy to look at the components singly, and at some much more than others. (Oller 1979:xv)

While there are, I am sure, some notable exceptions, in general, working ESL curricula seem to be non-rationalized, i.e. they are a loose collection of techniques, methodologies, and approaches which reside in the individual teachers or in the materials used, or they are rationalized according to a single narrow or rigid principle which dominates everything they do, e.g. mastery of discrete grammatical or other behavioral objectives.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
 MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karl Krahnke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
 INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
 EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
 CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

I believe that a planned curriculum does have benefits. Surprisingly, there are those who argue against this, preferring, instead, to structure a curriculum around the freely creative efforts of individual instructors. I will not deal with this argument here. Suffice it to say at this point that the laissez faire point of view suffers seriously from a lack of accountability.

The kind of curriculum discussed here is one with the purpose of preparing non-English speaking students for higher educational experiences in the United States. (I am aware that such programs are becoming somewhat of a minority enterprise within the profession, but they do represent one kind of teaching which is in demand and which does allow itself the luxury of a relatively high degree of definition.) The work leading up to this discussion is representative of curriculum development work currently going on at the Institute for Intercultural Learning in Seattle. This does not mean that the proposals offered here are descriptive of present teaching programs at the Institute. The content of this paper does reflect the thinking that is shaping the development of our ongoing program, however.

I. Current program rationales: the "standard model".

Academic preparation programs have been organized in several ways. One is to view English language ability as an isolatable entity, separate from other skills or knowledge needed for academic success. In this kind of program the language skills are taught in a way that does not explicitly recognize some of the cognitive or formal abilities in information processing and presentation (e.g. opinion formation, lecture decipherment, seminar participation, etc.) that are required in higher education.¹ Programs teaching toward standardized test competency are examples of this approach as such tests tend to treat linguistic ability as separable from more comprehensive academic performance.

Another approach to academic preparation ESL programs is what may be called the ESP approach. In this kind of program more or less extensive needs analyses have isolated a sub-set of language/communicative skills which are supposed to be necessary for successful performance within a defined range of academic activity. The vocabulary, structures, and rhetorical devices of a general activity (e.g. higher education) or a discipline (e.g. oceanography) are isolated and taught, most often using fairly traditional methodologies. The assumption in this approach is that the isolated elements constitute the sum total of a special realm of communication.

What both of these approaches presuppose or demand is a capacity for analysis of language and language behavior on the part of the student. They also demand a high degree

of motivation and tolerance for delay of reward on the part of the learner. The learner must be able to tolerate a lack of isomorphism between what she has to do in the end (e.g. learn medical technology via English) and what she has to do in the meantime, which is to learn a lot about English with the promise of being able to put it all together and get on with the job in the end. The underlying, and even sometimes explicitly expressed, assumption behind this lack of identity is that since analysis and motivation are required for success in an academic setting they should, therefore, be design features of the language teaching program preparing the learner for that academic setting. In other words, learn it now because it will be good for you later, not because it has any demonstrated effect now.

This teaching/learning model calling for a stage of language analysis followed by delayed synthesis is, I believe, the standard for the field, if the field has a standard. There are, however, alternatives to teaching language that do not require a stage of conscious manipulation of micro-skills. The basis for the alternative is the increasing evidence that both language processing and language acquisition are, or can be, largely unconscious and are governed much more by communicative and interactional constraints rather than by constraints based on the analysis and synthesis of linguistic elements.²

As one who has devoted a great deal of effort to the development of communicative/interactional methodologies, I am acutely aware of the over- and imprecise use of the term "communicative". In the following section of this paper I will define the sense in which I am using the term more precisely. For now, communicative teaching/learning can be defined as teaching and learning in which the means or instrument of instruction is the successful participation in communicative interaction. A convenient summary phrase is: teaching and learning a language through communication rather than teaching to communication.³

In discussions of academic preparation curricula with a number of people in the field I have encountered, at times, a strong resistance to the use of communicative techniques on the grounds that they fail to address or involve, either directly or instrumentally, the analytical sense that is asserted to be requisite for students in higher education.⁴ Resistance also seems to come from the mistaken belief that communicative techniques are effective only in producing informal and inaccurate verbal "fluency" and that such "fluency" is at odds with the formally constrained language appropriate to academic domains.

For at least two reasons (and there are others) I believe that the arguments offered against communicative experiences in academic preparation programs are mistaken.

First, the role of analysis and synthesis in language learning and language processing has been vastly over-emphasized. Linguistics has given us a great deal of knowledge about language forms and structures but very little insight into the processes we use in employing these forms and structures. In the absence of useful descriptions of language processing, language teaching has emphasized the elements at the expense of the processes. Synthesis of language elements into language use according to a discernable rule is, certainly, one possible process leading to language use. Krashen's Monitor Hypothesis (Krashen 1978 and elsewhere) and its accompanying evidence suggest that it may well be a minor one.⁵

Second, I become more convinced every day that the distinction between learning and acquisition is a valid and useful one, and that we are only beginning to understand the roles that these two modes play in the "getting" of a new language.

Analytic approaches address the learning mode primarily and overtly, and the acquisition mode only by chance. If, as I assert, language learning in general, and the continued learning of formal language skills and academic information processing abilities in particular, require more global and less analytic abilities, then the inclusion of communicative experiences in academic preparation curricula is both justified and necessary.

What I have attempted to establish so far is that the "standard" model for language teaching in an academic context is an analytic/synthetic one in which the instruction provides the elements and controlled use of the elements according to organizational principles which have little to do with language acquisition or language as used in communication or other, less immediate, use activities. The standard model is often justified on the grounds that academically bound students have or need the ability to learn through an abstract and analytic mode and that a more communicatively structured approach would sacrifice necessary formal accuracy.

II. Communicative or interactive teaching.

Much of the resistance I have perceived to the use of communicative techniques seems to come from a misunderstanding of the roles of acquisition and learning and from a failure to see that a communicative approach can and must be structured.

I have already offered a general definition of communicative language teaching/learning. That will be expanded somewhat now. Much of the thinking here has been developed in work I have done with Mary Ann Christison and has resulted in a number of papers that we have presented and published over the past several years. I have also benefitted greatly from discussions with the staff at the

Institute for Intecultural Learning.

The most effective way to clarify the communicative approach would be to contrast it further with the "standard model".

A. The "standard model".

As classically defined, the standard model of language teaching/learning requires that language units be identified for the language learner first. The units may be phonological, grammatical, semantic, functional, notional, literary, or anything else. The second step is to teach to conscious control over the units through controlled practice. The third step, if it is ever reached at all, is to remove the controls as much as possible and to allow the units to be "used".

The standard model explicitly or implicitly assumes the following:

1. A single learning style for all learners.
2. An adequate analysis of the relationship between language and communication.
3. A generally non-personal view of communication
4. The ability of learners to transfer easily from language learning to language use.
5. The suggestion that discovery or acquisition of language will result in bad habit formation and in irreparable inaccuracy in production.
6. A strong role for conscious planning in language use.
7. A sequencing of sub-skills only indirectly governed by the needs and constraints of language use.
8. The ability of learners to interest themselves in the business of language learning, per se, and to be willing and able to delay the fruits of that learning (i.e. a high instrumental motivation).

B. The communicative/interactional model.

In the communicative model, sequencing or structuring of instruction is done by means of global communicative objectives in which the emphasis is on "getting some work done" with the language.

Ideally, language learning experiences are made available to the learners in ways that maximize learner involvement and minimize resistance. This methodological consideration is crucial (but rather than take it up here, I am making it the subject of a separate paper. For now, judicious use of the work of Stevick [1976 & 1981] and some of the well-known alternative methodologies is recommended.)

By means of sufficient and appropriate linguistic input, conscious or unconscious imitation and adaptation, hypothesis formation and confirmation (guessing), and direct instruction, the learner gradually develops and refines her ability in the new language simultaneously. The overall strategy is to foster formal control over the language along with the individual, creative, and

social aspects. Objectives are global, immediate, and comprehensible to the learner. Quality of performance is constrained by success in the communicative effort.

The assumptions underlying the communicative model are.

1. There are a variety of learning styles.
2. We probably do not know what all of the elements of successful language use are, but, in general, we can recognize it when we see it.
3. Effective language use requires creativity and individuality as well as rule and convention.
4. Learning, in general, does not transfer. Attaining ability in a new language through acquisition avoids the transfer problem.
5. Correctness is only one variable in communicative success and is achieved gradually, primarily through increasingly sophisticated hypothesis formation.
6. Conscious planning plays only a minimal role in language use.
7. There is a direct relation between learning objectives and language use.
8. Language learning is, for most learners, instrumental to other goals. The benefits or effects of that learning should, therefore, be as immediately recognizable and available to the learner as possible.

What all of this leads to is structured acquisition. In the past, the usual alternative to analytic teaching/learning methods was a direct or immersion method, which many viewed as unstructured or unguided participation in the use of the new language. Such approaches have been justifiably criticized for their lack of accountability; it has been difficult to definewhat is being learned and how well it is being learned.

By structuring and sequencing acquisition enabling experiences we will shorten the distance between teaching/learning and doing, and we can bring acquisition into more formally constrained instructional settings.

For further definition of communicative language teaching experiences I refer you to the paper that Christison and I presented at the 1981 TESOL meeting (Krahnke & Christison 1981). The arguments presented in that paper are too long to summarize here, but its conclusion sets out five ideal criteria that communicative teaching/learning experiences should attempt to meet. The criteria are: real, meaningful, comprehensible, minimizing of negative affect, and not overtly instructional in intent.

In other papers we have discussed principles for activity choice and sequencing (Christison & Krahnke 1981, Christison, Krahnke, and Schroeder 1980, and elsewhere). These were general principles of choice and sequencing. More specific principles need to be developed for the specific needs

of academic preparation programs.

III. Designing the curriculum.

In this section I will first present several design features of an academic preparation ESL curriculum which includes communicative techniques. Following that, in the final section, a model curriculum with associated techniques and activities is described.⁶

The principles or design features I would like to focus attention on here are:

A. Formal recognition of the differing but necessary roles of both learning and acquisition.

Effective language use involves a complex of skills, combined sometimes into immediate verbal (or even written) fluency, and at other times into reflective evaluation of language behavior (monitoring). Neither acquisition alone, nor learning alone, can produce a fully capable student in a second-language, higher educational environment. The distinction between these two modes of attaining new knowledge or behaviors is still being clarified, but the operational rule-of-thumb is probably that anything that is "pick-up-able" (e.g. speaking and listening fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, etc.) is probably governed more by acquisition than by learning. Learning does play a role, however, in gaining effective control over matters such as spelling, punctuation, descriptive or prescriptive grammar, library and study skills, word formation, argument construction, style, and so on.

In recognizing the distinction between learning and acquisition we are better able to choose an instructional mode that is appropriate to the behavior that we are attempting to effect. Since even (!) college students need fluency, or communicative competence, some acquisition experiences are necessary.

B. Structuring and sequencing of the curriculum according to global and interactional objectives (rather than discrete linguistic or functional ones).

There are really two principles here, that of definition or structuring of objectives and that of sequencing of the objectives. If the two are naturally related, the resulting curriculum will have a more natural rationale.

1. Definition of objectives.

Generally, language learning objectives have been defined fairly narrowly and atomistically (e.g. demonstrate control over a particular structure, define X number of words, write a paragraph about something, perform a successful excuse, etc.). Such definition meets the classic learning constraints of confidence building through quick and clear demonstration to the learner of what she can do. It is the small and easy step approach. Objectives such as these are also quite easy to produce.

But micro objectives can be misleading and counter-productive. Real language use almost always involves a complex chain of skills and a close integration of those skills. The crucial step of integration is omitted from most curriculum definitions. Teachers have asserted to me that such real integration is not really possible in the classroom and is therefore not part of a teacher's responsibility.

When objectives are presented in artificial or micro terms only, the learner can, and usually does, substitute this artificial knowledge for real ability to use the language. Abstract objectives provide a ready-made, artificial alter ego for the learner who is usually desperately looking for one. If we only assume adequate synthesis of skills, or if we only lead up to synthesis and stop, then the learner never required to demonstrate what it is we really want her to know, and knows it.

Sets of atomistic or micro objectives which must be met by all learners also omit the creative and individual components of language and communicative performance.

Global objectives state what it is we expect learners to do in real performance terms and in terms which are immediate to them as language non-specialists. The transfer problem is addressed directly and learners are conditioned to think in terms of really getting something done in the language rather than in terms of the means to get something done.

Global objectives also function diagnostically in that they point up individual strengths and weaknesses as they appear in the real context of language use. Individual differences in development are a clear and necessary fact in second language development and by defining instruction in a broad and meaningful context, the instructor will be better able to deal with unavoidable individual differences in a positive and significant manner. When instruction is defined in globally communicative terms, specific language skills can be addressed in a way that encourages a sense of purpose, function, and audience.

An example of a global objective that we have used calls for the learner to first obtain a certain kind of information, usually somewhat unpredictable, from a native speaker for a particular purpose, say for eventual inclusion into a school handbook. (Some skills involved: questions and questioning technique, introductions, partings, gratitude, clarification, one-on-one, etc.) The learner must then pool and evaluate that information with others. (Opinion formation and statement, value negotiation, future and past time, small-group communication, etc.) Finally, the student writes the information up into a draft for editing into a real student handbook. (Editing skills, writing, a personal communication but with a sense of audience, etc.)

Students can be evaluated on their overall performance

on an activity such as the above; on the achievement of the global objective. Subordinate skills are addressed relative to the overall objectives, and only as required. Interaction with others, for the purpose of acquiring and transmitting information, provides a great deal of intake and fosters acquisition.

2. Sequencing of objectives.

Sequencing global objectives is both more important and more difficult than the sequencing of more artificial objectives. It is more difficult because we know less about the structure and development of cognitive and communicative skills than we know about English grammar. We just do not know what has to be learned before something else (not that we know that about English grammar either), but there are some general things we do know. Sequencing is more critical because, by intent, the task should contain much of the known and some of the unknown, presented in a manner that will allow it to be discovered. Without clear guidelines, it is often difficult to evaluate how much of one or the other we may be asking, and we may make the mistake of asking too much, and going over their heads, or of asking too little, and boring them.

Sequencing should be done using everything we can know, guess, or diagnose about the development of language in relation to the development of communicative abilities. Some of the principles we need to refer to are:

- a. The concrete, the immediate, and the personal precede the abstract, the remote, and the impersonal in the development of communicative ability.
- b. So-called "passive" or intake involvement generally precedes active or productive involvement.
- c. Successful communication requires a sense of audience and of how others can be expected to behave or react. Such a sense must be deliberately developed.
- d. Affective factors have more to do with the success of language acquisition than anything else, even for academically-bound learners.
- e. Most language skills are acquired gradually and instrumentally, through hypothesis formation. Mastery out of context, through instruction, is both chimerical and probably not useful.

The last principle clearly dictates a spiralled approach to the teaching/learning of both language form and communicative functions.⁸

IV. A curriculum model.

With the preceding rationale and and set of design features, it is now possible to discuss how to construct an academic preparation ESL curriculum which takes into account what we know of language acquisition and the relationship between language and its function in communication. There are more dimensions than can be included here, so

the following should not be viewed as comprehensive.

The curriculum being proposed should include at least the following:

A. Different instructional techniques for different levels of linguistic and communicative development.

1. Beginning levels of language development need a rapid introduction into the language. This is as true for academically bound learners as for any others. Affective filters need to be broken down and confidence needs to be built, confidence that it really is possible to get things done in the new language, confidence that the new language really is a language, and confidence that learning the new language is a possibility.

Instruction at beginning levels should make heavy use of acquisition activities, developing a meaning-rich linguistic environment by means of a lot of vocabulary and redundancy. Terrel's description of the "natural approach" (1977) is useful here, also Krashen and Terrel's forthcoming book on the same subject.

Topics and activities for beginning levels should involve the self and close others, using existing information and interests in a personal and immediate way. Heavy attention should be paid to the feelings level of communication ("I want ...", "I feel ...") and to personal identity ("I am ...", "I do ..."). Activities should be organized into relatively small chunks or units so learners can regularly experience the feeling of success. The emphasis should be on getting the language into the learner and on bringing the learner into the language, rather than on reshaping the learner to fit the language. Some of the latter may have to go on, but it can wait.

Literary skills can also be delayed until there is enough of the language to do the kinds of things that one really does with literacy, such as read for needed information (not to learn a language) and to write for the recording or transmitting of complex information (not to complete a structure exercise).

Grammatical development should be controlled by a covert syllabus presented in communicative terms and spirally. ("To say what you want to say you need to say it this way.") Accuracy is established as a value, but as a value that is instrumental in communicative success, not as an end in itself.⁹

Activities for beginning levels can include:

a. Passive but engaging observation/listening to activities of high interest and need in a way that maximizes comprehension. For example, at a very beginning level, we can formalize what many often do already. The instructor can present important features about himself to the class, who should be quite concerned with who he is already, with a great deal

of contextualized redundancy (gesture, repetition, movement, etc.). The instructor can then assist the students in performing the same function with each other (if it is appropriate in the real world). Activities like this can build vocabulary, copulative and attributive verbs, a sense of active observation and listening, self-words, and a sense of group and individual.

In general, activities can begin with real and necessary non-linguistic stimuli (people, realia, natural activities, chance events in the classroom, etc.) to which the appropriate language is gradually associated.

b. Identification of immediate individual and group communication needs and the development of strategies for dealing with them. Generally, these needs will be "daily life" activities, such as seeing a doctor. This can be presented in its initial, "passive", stage by a sincere recounting of such an experience by the instructor or a capable student. Chaining can lead from this to sincere questions from and about others in the group. Vocabulary can be built around a topic necessary use of tense distinctions can be demonstrated, modals will almost necessarily be involved, question comprehension can be developed, and clarification procedures refined.

Another activity of this type might require the learners to get some necessary (and real) piece of information by telephone, involving questioning techniques, technicalities and conventions of phone use, and meaning negotiation skills.

c. Instrumental introduction to literacy skills, i.e. the reading and writing of language material, within the capabilities of the learner, which is part of getting something done, e.g. the filling out of necessary forms. Such activities can, in addition to providing a meaningful and contextualized introduction to literacy, assist in developing abilities to use numbers and names, to recognize professions and how information is categorized in general, and to define the learners' place in the new world of English.

Obviously, there is, or should be, a great deal of familiarity about the suggested beginning activities. They are not mentioned for their novelty¹⁰. They are appropriate for academically-bound students, but most importantly, they can be the means of language instruction if they are viewed as such by the learners and handled to that end by the instructor.

2. Intermediate levels can be a transition from the predominantly acquisition mode of the beginning levels to the increasing use of formal learning, especially as regards the literacy skills, at the higher levels. (To the degree that a parallel holds, and it probably does not hold very much, intermediate levels can be thought of as cognitively and developmentally similar to native-language primary and junior high education.) Grammatical instruction can be introduced at intermediate levels to explain or describe to the learners what they can already do, the purpose being affective (meeting intellectual curiosity and expectations) and to begin to develop abstract and objective linguistic abilities.

3. Higher levels of instruction can make greater use of learning modes while still utilizing acquisition as much as the skills and subject matter will allow. Concerns of acquisition can also, as asserted previously, constrain the organization of the instruction through broadly specified special purpose objectives calling for real or relevant activities intended to develop academic skills. It is important that the instruction recognize the need for negotiating and hypothesis formation rather than mastery, and that formal recognition be given to individuality in approach and product.

Attention still needs to be paid to affective factors since they still play a major role in learning success and students entering at these levels still need to have their affective filters broken down.

Topics and activities at higher levels should become increasingly abstract, complex, and extensive without breaking instruction down into discrete skill areas. Activities can become longer, less personal, involve more new information, and should be organized into complexes which call for a close integration of skills. The feelings level can be somewhat minimized and the skills and intellectual levels given greater emphasis (Christison & Krahne 1981). Special attention needs to be paid to developing a sense of audience and to the notion of language and language use as a communicative phenomenon and not a purely intellectual one.

Literary skills will have to be emphasized and developed in a manner that clearly recognizes the different effects of acquisition and learning. Formal constraints on literacy performance should be presented as instrumental to the interactional function of a piece of writing. Deliberate learning units or modules (e.g. word formation, punctuation) can be subordinated to communicatively defined writing projects (e.g. summarize the lecture you heard yesterday, and which I didn't, so I can make some test questions from it to practice short answer question form). Study skills can be dealt with as components or ingredients or real or simulated academic experiences (e.g. what's the best way to get through that pile of information, or where can you find something out).

Grammatical and other considerations of language form can be addressed in two ways, explicitly as a prescriptive or descriptive body of information necessary or helpful for successful participation in higher educational experiences (i.e. a grammar course), or instrumentally as individual development or remedial work needed for a particular academic project. Individualized or small group grammar instruction can also be provided to students whose learning styles or educational bias seems to call for it.

Activities at higher levels can include:

- a. Active involvement in information-gathering and processing using increasingly real materials and resources. For example, individually find and read a series of articles on a topic with different styles and different points of view. Exchange the information in small groups or evaluate the information with an instructor or someone else, leading to presentation of the processed information in written or oral form to an audience which does not have the information and wants or needs to know it. An activity such as this involves library or other research skills, reading skills of skimming, scanning, and critical reading, opinion and judgement formation, and appropriate form in writing or oral presentation.
- b. Structured development of active listening skills through participation in increasingly real lecture or seminar/discussion activities. Initially the stimulus (teacher, tape, trained outsider) is modified to provide access to the information for the learners with the listening skills they already have. As the stimuli are made increasingly authentic and difficult, the instructor assists the learners in developing effective strategies for apprehending the information. The activity is contextualized by requiring that something further than decoding be done with the information, i.e. information processing steps such as those in the previous section, or summarizing, outlining, or exchanging the information for some higher purpose. Activities such as this involve selective listening skills, decoding and recoding, and reorganization or editing skills.

B. Deliberate depersonalization of language behavior through increasingly culture-specific or abstract stimuli and information. Requiring the learners to develop increasingly objective rather than subjective points of view.

Using the same type of activities suggested above, learners can be encouraged to make judgements about tone, point of view, kind of evidence, quantity of evidence, etc.

If carried out as a group project, with each member gathering only a part of the information, objectivity will be increased through joint effort and the need for agreement, and the immediate audience (the group) will have a greater built-in interest.

Another activity involves debating a topic.¹¹ Students can be asked to participate in small-group work or to work individually to develop a presentation of a point of view persuasively and formally before an uninformed audience (for whom it can be a listening experience). Objectivity and sense of audience can be increased by having the audience write objective evaluations. Participants can also write summaries of the arguments.

C. Increased use of individualized learning activities as the general aspects of the language have developed and individual strengths, weaknesses, and needs have become more apparent. Writing labs, tutorials, individualized and self-paced learning modules are especially justified here, related, as much as possible, to the larger information processing projects. Individualization can be effective either as part of full-time language study or as an adjunct to actual participation in academic classwork.

V. Conclusion.

What I have presented is a rationale and model for and academic preparation ESL curriculum which meets the constraints of what we know of communicatively-based language teaching/learning and still leads to the outcomes that are perceived as necessary for students in higher education.

By making the objectives as real, as immediate, and as global as possible; by requiring analytical techniques in information processing rather than in language learning by choosing teaching techniques appropriate to different stages of language development; and by requiring accuracy instrumentally to success in information processing; we can assist our students in getting to where they need to be while we adhere to what we know about successful language learning.

What an approach such as this requires, however, is a curriculum with a well-defined overall design which provides a shape and rationale for the selection and development of specific techniques to lead specific students to specific goals. It is a curriculum which is not limiting or confining to either student or teacher as it allows for gradual and individual but responsible and accountable language development and takes motivation and purpose directly into account. It does not revolutionize anything we are presently doing. It does attempt to rationalize what we are doing.

NOTES

1. There remains a questions as to just what skills are required in various higher educational endeavours. Few needs analyses have been carried out. Two recent ones (Johns 1981, Ostler 1980) strongly suggest that our assumptions in this area may not be sufficient and that much more work needs to be done.
2. I am not asserting identity between first and second language learning. That question will be unsettled for some time to come. What is unavoidably clear, hwever, is that acquisition or unconscious learning can work for adults learning a second language as well as for children learning a first. What is not as clear is that formal learning can lead to similar results. If acquisition can work, it behooves us to find out how it works, or at least to take advantage of it wherever we can.
3. The question might arise here, "But where do they learn the things they need to be able to participate in interaction? Don't they have to learn those first?" This question is fundamental to an acquisition hypothesis, too fundamental to be argued here. In brief, interaction is more basic than language. Adult learners come with a predilection for and skill in interaction. Language forms are secondary to that and can be acquired in the course of the interaction if the interaction is carefully structured and sequenced to that end. An acquisition approach first structures the interactional experience and then makes available, in as many ways as possible, the language forms that are or can be associated with that experience. That is what is meant by learning instrumentally.
4. An extreme position on this is taken by Goldin (1977) who, in responding to Terrell (1977), asserts that the primary reason for teaching languages in an academic setting (foreign languages to university students) is that such study "requires a student to analyze and categorize in a way not encountered in other academic subjects." (1977:338) He goes on to say that "a student wishing to approximate the behavior of a native speaker of L² is better advised to study abroad, or attend a specialized language academy, than to study L² in a high school or college." This position is extreme, but it is evidence that analytic skills can be valued above communicative ones.

5. Krashen, in public talks, has responded to Wilga Rivers' criticism of the monitor hypothesis by identifying what he calls the "Wilga Rivers Syndrome", which is the tendency for language professionals who are concerned with language form and structure on a day-to-day professional basis to project the consciousness with which they process language and refer to language rules onto non-professionals who probably make very little use of conscious knowledge.
6. To some, this presentation may be "long on theory and short on practice." My only response is that I have come to believe that our field is too often guilty of too much practice and not enough theory. We are so concerned with new and interesting things to do in the classroom that we are often guilty of rediscovery of the wheel and of practice which represents no discernable principle. It is the role of curriculum planning to identify principles and to relate creativity and practice to them.
7. I am especially indebted to Judith Rodby of the Institute for Intercultural Learning for a description of this kind of activity.
8. See Knowles (1981?) for an interesting discussion of this.
9. Skill in knowing when and how to intervene in encouraging accuracy is one of the qualities of a good teacher. It is sometimes asserted that the teacher's role is made superfluous in a communicative approach. This is the opposite of the truth and skill in fostering accuracy is only one point where a teacher has much to contribute.
10. (Delete this note.)
11. Janet Constantinides (1980) has developed this activity.

REFERENCES

- Christison, M.A., K. Krahne, and T. Schroeder. 1980. A structured approach to the conversation class. I-TESOL Papers 1: 28-37.
- Christison, M.A. and K. Krahne. 1981. Communication strategies for ESL. TESOL Newsletter XV, No. 2.
- J. Constantinides and C. Hall. 1981. Advanced composition: Beginning at the top. Paper delivered at the 1981 TESOL Convention, Detroit. (To appear in On TESOL, 1981.)
- Goldin, M. 1977. Who wouldn't want to use the natural approach? Modern Language Journal 61, 7: 337-339.
- Johns, A. 1981. Necessary English: A faculty survey. TESOL Quarterly 15, 1: 51-57.
- Knowles, P. 1981 (?). Challenges for curriculum design. Cross Currents
- Krahne, K. and M.A. Christison. 1981. Communication and second language teaching. Paper delivered at the 1981 TESOL convention, Detroit.
- Krashen, S. 1978. The monitor model for second language acquisition. In Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching. Rosario Gingras, ed. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics. 1-26.
- Oller, J. 1979. Language Tests at School. London: Longman.
- Ostler, S. 1980. A survey of academic needs for advanced ESL. TESOL Quarterly 14, 4: 489-502.
- Stevick, E. 1978. Memory, Meaning, and Method. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury.
- _____. 1981. A Way and Ways. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury.
- Terrell, T. 1977. A natural approach to second language acquisition and learning. Modern Language Journal 61, 7: 325-337.